REMARKS

This current Reply is responsive to a current and non-final Office Action dated (mailed) 06/22/2005. This current Office Action examined claims 1-26.

Generally, the current Office Action rejected claims 1-26.

Specifically, the current Office Action indicated the following:

Claims 1, 9, and 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 15-22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al. (US 2002101 09717).

Claims 1-21, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bass et al. (US 6,591,403).

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (US 2002/0109717).

No claims are canceled or added by this Reply. Hence, claims 1-26 are now presented for examination. Of claims 1-26, claims 1, 9, and 15 are independent.

Unreturned PTO-1449s

It appears that two previously-submitted PTO-1449s as part of two separate Information Disclosure Statements (IDSs) have not been returned.

The first was submitted on/around 10/20/2003 and listed five (5) non-patent documents A-E. It was probably designated Paper No. 3 or 4.

The second was submitted on/around 02/10/2004 and listed three (3) U.S. Patents A-C. It was probably designated Paper No. 4 or 5.

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider the documents submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.97 and 1.98, initial and sign the corresponding PTO-1449s to indicate such consideration, and return copies of the initialed and signed PTO-1449s to Applicants.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph

The rejection of claims 1, 9, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, in the current Office Action on page 2 reads:

> Claims 1, 9, and 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically is unsure where in the specification is there support for the phrase "*independent* of compilation" added to independent claims 1, 9, and 15.

As explained in the immediately previous Reply on page 8, the phrase **independent of compilation** is intended to convey that the "execution of the executable command may occur without compilation."

Thus, support in the original Patent Application disclosure for the element **independent of compilation** may be found at, for example:

(1) "The processor replaces the macro with the appropriate command and executes the command line." Page 2, Lines 21-22

(2) "A command line processor operating in accordance with this embodiment of the invention identifies the macro by the brackets and calls the function whose name is inside the brackets. The function then searches the system registry and finds the name of the directory in which "MyProgram.exe" is located. The function returns the name to the command line processor. The command line processor then substitutes the directory name for the macro. After the macro has been expanded; the batch file now looks like this: dir c:\MyDirectory

MyProgram.exe. The command lines inside the batch file can now be executed properly." Page 7, Lines 1-11

(3) "In another embodiment of the invention, a macro is used on a command line to display the dialog box that allows the user to enter information at the time the command line is processed. The information can then be included in the command line prior to the command line being executed." Page 7, Lines 12-15

In each of the three examples identified above from the original disclosure of the instant Patent Application, the command line may be executed without compilation. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed subject matter, including the **independent of compilation** element, was properly and sufficiently described in the original Specification.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) with respect to Li et al. and Bass et al.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8, 15-22, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al. in the current Office Action on page 3 reads:

> Claims 1-4, 6-8, 15-22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al. (US 2002101 09717).
>
> As per claims 1-4,6-8,15-22, and 26, Li teaches a system for processing command line input, the system comprising: a command line interface (GUI) comprising a set of executable commands; and a command line processor for, at least; parsing the command line input; identifying one or more macros within the input, expanding the one or more macros into at least one executable command of the command line interface, and executing the commands independent of compilation. (Abstract, pg.2-6)
>
> Li teaches the use of a GUI interface wherein the user has the ability to input a macro wherein the inputted macro is automatically or manually selected from a list of executable macro commands. The inputted macro is then expanded into an executable macro command. (see Figs. 5-8)

The rejection of claims 1-21, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bass et al. in the current Office Action on pages 3-4 reads:

> As per claims 1-21.24, and 25, Bass teaches a system for processing command line input, the system comprising: a command line interface (GUI) comprising a set of executable commands; and a command line processor for, at least; parsing the command line input; identifying one or more macros within the input, expanding the one or more macros into at least one executable command of the command line interface, and executing the commands independent of compilation. (Abstract, col. 4, lines 44-col. 5, lines 1-51, col. 6, lines 15-col.12)
>
> Bass teaches a test system having a GUI and a macro (command line processor) wherein the macro processor accessing a macro definition of the assertion macro corresponding to the assertion macro call, using the macro definition as a template to automatically generate a replacement HDL code, substituting the replacement HDL code for the assertion macro call in the input HDL code independent of compilation.

Response to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejections

The Office Action applies two different references against the claims: Li et al. and Bass et al. It appears that the Office Action is incorrectly applying the general use of macros to the specific claims in the instant Patent Application.

The "Technical Field" on the first page of the instant patent Application reads: "This invention relates generally to command line processing and, more particularly, to the use of macros in command line processing." As indicated by the "Technical Field", the instant Patent Application is not intending to patent the *concept* of macros. Instead, certain implementations of the invention relate in particular to "the use of macros *in command line processing*."

It is noted that neither Li et al. nor Bass et al. relates to using macros in command line processing. In fact, neither command line interface nor command line processing appears to be mentioned anywhere in either reference. More specifically, it is respectfully submitted that both Li et al. and Bass et al. fail to describe or render obvious the use of macros in command line processing.

With respect to Li et al., only a host application (that is to be or that is being) customized and a specialized execution engine are described. For example, Li et al. reads on page 3 at paragraph [0035]:

> FIG. 4 is a block diagram illustrating the presentation flow of customized host interface in accordance with a preferred embodiment of the present invention. A web page for a host application may be designed in several ways, for example, by creating a list of specific tasks invoking macros to return host information, apply a default customization of host screens, apply individual customization of host screens, and a mixture of invoking macros, default

customization and individual customization of host screens. *An administrator may specify a list of macros to use for the customized host application and when to switch among macros. At runtime, an execution engine may automatically start and track execution of the macros and automatically switch between the macro customization mode and the screen by screen customization mode.* In the macro customization mode, the user session is executing a macro from an associated macro list and the macro may control the customization of the encountered host application screens. In the screen customization mode, no macro may be active. If no macro is active, the user session may display an individually customized or default host application screen one by one.

(*italicized* emphasis added)

With respect to Bass et al., only a specialized "SPECIFICATION MACRO PROCESSOR 130" of FIG. 3 is described. For example, Bass et al. reads at column 8, line 55 to column 9, line 7 as follows:

The verification design written by a design engineer is provided to specification macro processor 130 as HDL source code having SMAC calls. The ability of the specification macro processor 130 to accept and properly process HDL source code with generic SMAC calls relieves the design engineer from having to be aware of the coding requirements of various types of tools. As will be described, the specification macro processor 130 reads the incoming HDL source code with SMAC calls 110 and, in accordance with SMAC definition library 120, and replaces an occurrence of a SMAC call in the HDL code with an HDL code fragment, contained within the SMAC Definition Library 120, to obtain the resultant HDL source code 140. The HDL code fragment may itself contain a call to a module contained within tool-specific module libraries 150.sub.1 . . . n. When the resultant HDL source code 140 is run by a verification tool 160, that tool, in response to module calls encountered within the resultant HDL source code 140, will access its corresponding library 150 to expand the module calls into the source code necessary to implement the verification.

(*italicized* emphasis added)

In contrast to the conventional specialized uses of macros described in Li et al. and Bass et al., the instant Patent Application relates in particular to "the use of macros in *command line processing*."

Hence, no art of record, either alone or in any combination, anticipates or renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other elements of their respective claims:

Claim 1: **replacing the macro with an executable command of the command line interface.**

Claim 9: **expanding the macro into an executable command of a command line interface.**

Claim 15: **a command line interface comprising a set of executable commands . . . a command line processor for, at least . . . expanding the one or more macros into at least one executable command of the command line interface.**

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1-22 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with respect to Li et al.

The rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. in the current Office Action on page 4 reads:

> As per claims 23, Li does not expressly teach the use of a DOS prompt, however Li does teach the use of GUI operating system prompt. Nonetheless, the use of the DOS prompt is well known in the art, thereby making use of this interface obvious.

It is noted that the current Office Action does not include a citation to any particular figure or textual portion of Li et al. for this rejection. It is respectfully submitted that Li et al. does not describe or suggest a GUI operating system prompt, especially in the context of a command line interface. This deficiency of the Li et al. reference is addressed in detail herein above with regard to the 102 anticipation rejections.

Accordingly, there is no motivation in Li et al. (or any other art of record) to add and/or to substitute any particular command line interface prompt, much less the particular claimed prompt (i.e., the DOS prompt) into the teachings of Li et al. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims

Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 9, and 15 have been provided above. Claims 2-8/22-26, 10-14, and 16-21 depend directly or indirectly from these independent claims 1, 9, and 15, respectively. Although each also includes additional element(s) militating toward allowability, these dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons given above in connection with their respective independent claims.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of claims 1-26 are allowable. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to pass the instant Patent Application to issue with appropriate haste.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9/22/2005 By: Keith W. Saunders

Keith W. Saunders
Reg. No. 41,462
(509) 324-9256 x238